ID:88076705

Box 14
Item 33

Bureau of Land Management

Greater GRSG (GRSG) Collaboration and Engagement Situational Assessment Report

August 2016

DRAFT

Project Contacts:

Laura Van Riper, BLM National Riparian Service Team Social Scientist (541-416-6702, lvanripe@blm.gov)

Robert Fisher, DOI Office of Collaborative Action and Dispute Resolution (202-494-4704, robert_fisher@ios.gov)

Bryant Kuechle, The Langdon Group Senior Project Manager (208-739-3048, bk@langdongroupinc.com)

Cover Photo Credits (left to right): Jeff Fontana, BLM (https://blmca.sites.usa.gov/2015/09/22/GRSG-conservation-group-working-hard-in-ne-calif/); BLM Carson City District (http://www.blm.gov/nv/st/en/info/newsroom/2014/september/media_tour_showcasing.html)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Executive Summary 1

2. Methodology 4

3. Comprehensive Summary 6
   - 3.1. Introduction 6
   - 3.2. Background 6
   - 3.3. Findings and Recommendations 9

4. Internal Summary 13
   - 4.1. Introduction 13
   - 4.2. Findings and Recommendations 13

5. Idaho Comprehensive Report 16
   - 5.1. Introduction 16
   - 5.2. Background 16
   - 5.3. Findings and Recommendations 17

6. Montana Comprehensive Report 21
   - 6.1. Introduction 21
   - 6.2. Background 21
   - 6.3. Findings and Recommendations 21

7. Nevada Comprehensive Report 24
   - 7.1. Introduction 24
   - 7.2. Background 24
   - 7.3. Findings and Recommendations 25
   - 7.4. California 27

8. Wyoming Comprehensive Report 29
   - 8.1. Introduction 29
   - 8.2. Background 29
   - 8.3. Findings and Recommendations 29

APPENDICIES

   - A. Internal Memo 33
   - B. Discussion Guide 35
   - C. Stakeholder Letter 37
   - D. State Comparison Table 38
   - E. Participating Organizations or Representing Interests 39
   - F. Oregon Solutions SAGECON Assessment Summary Report (Fall 2016) 40

DRAFT

DRAFT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (1)

At the request of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), The Langdon Group (TLG), a subcontractor of Kearns & West through the US Department of Interior, Office of Collaborative Action and Dispute Resolution (CADR), conducted a situational assessment of collaboration and engagement efforts related to the development of the BLM's Greater Sage-Grouse (GRSG) management plans. This included assessing the status, accomplishments, questions, and concerns of state and locally-based GRSG stakeholders. The assessment's intended purpose was to develop a thorough understanding of the interests, concerns, and opinions that exist across the GRSG landscape, both internally within the BLM and externally from a diversity of stakeholders. The resulting findings and recommendations are presented in this report to help inform the BLM's stakeholder engagement strategy to support GRSG implementation. This report is also intended to supplement input gathered through federal family training and external stakeholder workshops that occurred in April 2016.

This report is the product of feedback received from conversations with 47 internal BLM employees from the eight targeted BLM state offices (California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Wyoming) and GRSG leadership at the national and regional levels; and 37 external stakeholders from across the GRSG range. Efforts have been made to incorporate in this report the opinions and interests of all parties that participated in the assessment. Key interest groups emerged through the assessment process that favored a logical catalogue of input in the following formats:

- **Comprehensive Summary:** Combination of internal and external stakeholder input, grouped in themes of findings and recommendations.
- **Internal Stakeholder Summary:** Internal input gathered in conversations with each of the eight BLM state offices and national/regional GRSG leadership, written to supplement information shared in the Comprehensive Summary section.
- **Individual State Comprehensive Reports*:** Input gathered from four GRSG states (Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and Wyoming), written to provide specific background, findings, and recommendations for the representative state office.

** Of the eight BLM state offices, the Utah BLM did not conduct an external assessment; Colorado had limited external stakeholder participation; and the Oregon external stakeholder assessment and summary is being managed by Oregon Consensus, a service of the Oregon Solutions Network and Portland State University, with completion expected in Fall 2016 (**APPENDIX F**). California external stakeholders are combined with the Nevada summary.*

TLG worked closely with each BLM state office to select individuals for the focused conversations that would represent external stakeholder interests. TLG used a discussion guide to help facilitate conversations when necessary and to reference a set of core questions asked of all participants (**APPENDIX B**).

Internal and external stakeholder comments consistently centered on the following themes:

- Decision Space and Process
    - Recommendation: Clearly defined decision space for stakeholder input is critical for successful engagement efforts moving forward.
- Messaging and Communication

    - Recommendation: For future engagement efforts to be successful, messaging needs to be timely, constant, and consistent among the states, as well as among the field and district offices.
- Customized Local Engagement
    - Recommendation: On-the-ground engagement and planning must be customized to meet the needs and interests of the community and led by local BLM staff.
- Local Decision-making Authority
    - Recommendation: For BLM field staff to be successful, they must be given a greater degree of decision-making power and flexibility within the organization and that impact external interests.

In support of these general recommendations, the assessment consistently revealed specific insights and recommendations from both internal and external stakeholders:

- Leverage field office level relationships with local stakeholders to increase the likelihood for effective stakeholder engagement.
- Collaboration is possible despite existing conflict and is key to avoiding a future Endangered Species Act (ESA) listing.
- Consider the impacts of actions on neighboring states/property ownership lines.
- Clarify the roles of the implementation teams (i.e., DC level, regional offices and district offices).
- Cooperation and progress will vary by state and effective efforts will differ for each state and local area, therefore, there should not be a one-size-fits all engagement formula.
- BLM's institutional memory and knowledge are important factors and must be preserved.
- Mitigate rumors through effective messaging and shared understanding.
- Other BLM efforts impact GRSG policy and close internal coordination needs to occur with those interests.
- Consider GRSG as part of the larger ecosystem and include in a range of BLM conversations.
- Define the collaboration parameters, such as the areas for the public to have opportunities for meaningful involvement and the areas considered informational only.
- Recognize that policy changes will impact stakeholder relationships and trust with the BLM.
- Maintain consistent internal and external messaging without gaps.
- Draw on field office staff expertise where discipline integration is fostered as a model for effective interdisciplinary teams at the state and WO levels.
- Leverage the success of private and local efforts.
- State offices have used the following processes and techniques successfully, among others: active participation with Local Work Groups (LWG) – the level of current activity and sophistication varies across the landscape and LWG's with private contributions are more viable; community field tours and open houses with topic-specific stations; regular tribal consultations; frequently updated online presence; and leveraging existing/established non-GRSG stakeholder groups, specifically Resource Advisory Councils (RAC).

DRAFT

Overall, stakeholders expressed appreciation that the BLM was dedicating time and resources to better understand their concerns and provided a variety of ideas for helping the BLM engage locally with the public throughout the GRSG implementation phase. However, stakeholders expressed caution when considering the implications if action is taken on these recommendations, including:

- GRSG will require horizontal and vertical messaging in a way that BLM has never experienced and will influence how all future BLM planning processes are conducted.
- The concept of local actions with regional goals is new to most people. The trust built between stakeholders and the BLM state/field offices eroded after WO's last minute decisions ran counter to established agreements. Local partners felt disenfranchised and lost trust with BLM. This situation also strained the relationships between state and field offices.
- The process of defining the sideboards/decision space for state/field offices must be improved.
- There is suspicion that land use plans developed with LWG's may be amended.

The assessment process allowed for candid and valuable input and was widely viewed by stakeholders as a positive step in building public goodwill. External stakeholders consistently expressed a genuine interest in successful engagement opportunities moving forward.

DRAFT

METHODOLOGY (2)

Participants in the internal assessment groups were self-identified by the respective state offices. TLG designated a point-of-contact in each state office. This state office representative determined the appropriate participants for a group conversation, conducted via telephone in six states, and in-person in Idaho and Utah. Internal groups in each state ranged from three to seven. TLG also facilitated a call of six national- and regional-level BLM representatives directly involved in GRSG implementation.

Participants in the external assessment were identified by the internal assessment participants in each state office from draft lists of potential stakeholders as identified by TLG through online research. It was understood that not all interested parties would participate in the assessment. The goal was to identify a cross-section of eight to twelve stakeholders in each state that represent a range of interests and perspectives.

Of the eight GRSG states, four (Idaho, Montana, Nevada and Wyoming) identified sufficient numbers of external stakeholders to conduct thorough statewide assessments and generate state-specific reports. On average, two-thirds of contacted external stakeholders responded and conversations occurred. California provided a minimal number of stakeholders that were folded in to the Nevada report; Colorado provided a minimal number of stakeholders, whose comments were captured in the Comprehensive Summary; Utah elected not to conduct an external assessment and in Oregon it was discovered that Oregon Consensus (OC), a service of the Oregon Solutions Network and Portland State University was conducting a virtually identical effort. Stakeholders and conversation guidance in the OC assessment were similar enough to the BLM effort that is was determined conducting two processes would cause unnecessary confusion. When complete, the OC summary report will be included in the BLM assessment report (**APPENDIX F**). One external stakeholder conversation did occur in Oregon. This input was captured in the Comprehensive Summary.

Each state office point-of-contact from the internal assessment group notified external assessment subjects via email in advance of contact from TLG. Email content generally utilized language developed by TLG and approved by BLM (**APPENDIX C**). TLG scheduled and conducted most conversations via telephone. Four conversations in Idaho and one in Utah were conducted in-person.

Conversations were conducted informally allowing the stakeholders to drive the direction and discuss the issues that were most important to them. Interviews were not conducted using a specific set of questions asked of all subjects; therefore, the resulting summary does not provide quantifiable data other than general percentages of frequency for the purpose of term definition (described below). Instead, this report is intended to provide a window into the opinions, issues, and concerns that exist among a diverse sub-set of stakeholders.

TLG interviewers used the discussion guide (**APPENDIX B**) to identify appropriate subject areas and corresponding questions when and if the conversations needed help. Every effort was made by the interviewer to ask a set of core questions at the appropriate times in the conversation.

Terms are used throughout the summary document to describe similar comments that were heard with varying degrees of frequency. For the purposes of this document, those terms are defined as the following. Percentages were determined through simple calculations of frequency.

> **Majority, Most**: Over 50 percent of assessment participants, internal and external unless otherwise noted in the content.

DRAFT

Some: Less than 50 percent of assessment participants, internal and external, unless otherwise noted in the content.

Strong Majority, Consistently: Over 80 percent of assessment participants, internal and external, unless otherwise noted in the content.

Themes: Indicated as sub-heads throughout the document, these themes emerged in over 75 percent of the conversations. Comments within each theme may vary, but they all pertain to the same overarching issue.

Some verbiage and words have specific meaning in their usage throughout this document. Those are:

Decisions Space: The range in which an individual or group has the opportunity to provide input that will have some meaningful influence on a decision.

External: Stakeholders outside of BLM. This includes state and local government, general public and non-government organizations.

Internal: Stakeholders within the BLM.

Sideboards: Similar to decision space, this term used frequently by internal BLM stakeholders refers to the constraints that exist for an individual or group to have meaningful involvement in a decision making process. Wide sideboards allow for more opportunity for participation with influence than narrow sideboards, which provide very little opportunity to influence a decision or process.

Recommendations provided in this document are from the assessment participants, not TLG. Bulleted lists within recommendations sections of this documents are ordered in frequency. Recommendations higher in the list were echoed by more than one party.

DRAFT

COMPREHENSIVE SUMMARY (3)

Introduction

The following Comprehensive Summary is the result of feedback received in conversations with 47 internal BLM employees from the eight targeted BLM state offices (California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Wyoming) and GRSG leadership at the national and regional levels; and 37 external stakeholders from across the GRSG range representing state government, local government, LWG's, state/governor-appointed working groups, cattlemen/grazing interests, conservation organizations, sportsmen, academic institutions, and the oil, gas, and mining industries.

To identify appropriate representation of external stakeholder interests, TLG worked closely with each BLM state office to determine individuals for the focused conversations. While several of these stakeholders participated on LWG's, the strong majority were primarily involved with the state-appointed councils charged with developing the state-level GRSG conservation plans. Because each stakeholder had a different level of participation in both the local and state efforts, as well as formal coordination with the BLM, discussion topics varied.

While TLG let the stakeholders' interests and concerns drive the direction of the conversation, consistent themes emerged throughout regardless of stakeholder interest and location. Overall, stakeholders expressed appreciation that the BLM was dedicating time and resources to better understand their concerns and provided a variety of ideas for helping the BLM engage locally with the public throughout the GRSG implementation phase. The assessment process was widely viewed by stakeholders, internal and external, as a positive step in building public goodwill.

Background

Federal Status

On March 5, 2010, the US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) identified the GRSG as a "candidate species" for inclusion under the ESA and protection was classified as "warranted but precluded." Over the next five years, dozens of agencies across 11 states implemented conservation measures that the FWS concluded were successful in conserving, and even increasing, the populations of the GRSG. Draft Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) were released in 2013 and finalized in May 2015.

On September 22, 2015, the US Department of Interior determined that the conservation programs executed over the previous five years had been so successful, formal listing of the GRSG under the ESA was unnecessary. The FWS concluded:

> "The Service's decision follows an unprecedented conservation partnership across the western United States that has significantly reduced threats to the GRSG across 90 percent of the species' breeding habitat. The Service has determined that protection for the GRSG under the Endangered Species Act is no longer warranted and is withdrawing the species from the candidate species list."

Currently, the BLM and US Forest Service (USFS), in coordination with local agencies and partners, are implementing the GRSG Conservation Strategy Land Management Plan. The management plan will amend 98 land use plans that incorporate regional science-based conservation strategies. The BLM and USFS also recommended mineral withdrawal permits be withheld because they identified some hardrock mining as a threat to GRSG habitat. The Secretary of the Interior will exercise the office's

DRAFT

authority to safeguard the most important landscapes identified by the FWS within Priority Habitat Management Areas – identified as Sagebrush Focal Areas – by withdrawing them from the operation of the hardrock mining law. This will not impact pre-existing mineral rights, but removes ten million acres from possible mining operations.

Conservation on BLM or USFS lands across the regions follows a three-tiered management approach that categorizes three types of land by descending value to GRSG habitat:

1. Sagebrush Focal Areas (SFAs) – important landscape blocks with high breeding population densities of GRSG, existing high-quality sagebrush habitat, and a preponderance of federal ownership or protected area.
2. Priority Habitat Management Areas (PHMAs) – managed to avoid and minimize further disturbance.
3. General Habitat Management Areas (GHMAs) – provide greater flexibility for land use activities.

State Plans

From 2008– 2015, each GRSG state (except California, which works cooperatively with Nevada) implemented a statewide conservation plan through a Governor's Executive Order. Each plan was led by a state agency, with oversight by a diverse council/committee/task force, which included representation from each of the state's LWG's. The state plans include common elements across the range to address threats to the species, while also allowing for state-based variations where different approaches or priorities were consistent with the overall conservation objectives. The federal plans build upon the foundation for GRSG conservation initiated by a number of states, including Idaho's three-tiered conservation approach, Wyoming and Montana's Core Area Strategy, and Oregon's "All lands, All Threats" approach. The plans also reflect guidance developed collaboratively by the BLM and USFS to reflect feedback on the draft plans from the FWS.

Each LWG plan adheres to the conservation measures put forward in their respective state plan, drills down further at the mid- and fine-scale to address the uniqueness of their specific region, and proposes action for meaningful conservation on the ground.

DRAFT

Local Working Groups (LWG)

LWG membership represents a range of stakeholders including farmers, ranchers, state and federal agency staff, tribal and local governments, the energy industry, environmental groups, non-governmental organizations, and other concerned citizens. Each group is responsible for the development and implementation of a conservation plan to address the threats to GRSG populations and habitats in their area. LWG's are organized by state, with some operating across state lines. LWG's identified their status in one of the following ways:

- Waiting for agency lead, meeting for updates.
- Meeting, writing plan.
- Writing plan, implementing projects.
- Finalizing plan.
- Implementation.
- Implementation, prioritizing needs, Conservation Agreement with Assurances (CCAA).
- Plan complete, implementing, prioritizing actions.
- Plan complete, implementing.
- Mostly inactive, plan completed and projects implemented.

Most states' LWG's are uniform in their current phase. The following lists the 53 unique LWG's within the assessment study area, by state, with a brief status summary statement, based on available information.

- Colorado (5 LWG's): All in different phases. Middle Park; North Park; Northern Eagle/Southern Routt; Northwest Colorado; Piceance/Parachute/Roan.
- Idaho (12 LWG's): Mostly completed plan/implementing or writing a plan. Big Desert; Challis; Curlew; East Idaho Uplands; Jarbidge; Mountain Home; North Magic Valley; Owyhee; Shoshone Basin; South Magic Valley; Upper Snake ID; West Central ID.
- Montana (4 LWG's): Active, local conservation plans complete and engaged in grazing workshop. Central MT Organized Conservation District; Dillon; Glasgow; Miles City/Forsyth.
- Nevada (8 LWG's, includes multi-state with California): Implementing, three Inactive. Bi-State; Lincoln; North Central NV; Northeastern NV Stewardship Program; South Central NV; Stewardship Alliance for Northeast Elko County (SANE); Washoe/Modoc (with CA); White Pine.
- Oregon (5 LWG's): Implementing, their local action plans are complete. Baker; Burns; Lakeview; Prineville; Vale.
- Utah (12 LWG's): LWG's are implementing projects, their local action plans are complete and they are prioritizing needs. Cache/East Box Elder; Castle County; Color County; Dove Creek/Monticello; Morgan/Summit; Parker Mountain; Rich County; Southwest Desert; Strawberry Valley; Uintah Basin; West Box Elder; West Desert.
- Wyoming (8 LWG's): Implementing, their local action plans are complete. Bates Hole/Shirley Basin; Big Horn Basin; Northeast WY (Powder River Basin); Southcentral WY; Southwest WY; Upper Green River Basin; Upper Snake River Basin WY; Wind River/Sweetwater River Basin.

DRAFT

Findings and Recommendations

Input received both internally and externally consistently aligned around common themes. Corresponding recommendations are categorized either "internal/external" or "external." "Internal/external" recommendations were heard by most respondents from both groups. External recommendations were heard by some external participants. Internal-only recommendations are listed in Chapter 4.

Decision Space and Process

Clearly defined decision space for stakeholder input is critical for successful engagement efforts moving forward. Across the GRSG landscape, participants consistently expressed concern with perceived Washington Office (WO) overreach, insufficient review periods, and lack of meaningful responses to questions and comments. Some noted that the BLM plan amendments and state-developed plans are not as inconsistent as perceived. However, relationships with on-the-ground stakeholders and state/local governments were damaged more from disappointment in the plan amendment *process* than the substantive changes. It was widely felt that the actual sideboards for input were much narrower than what was communicated. Mistrust and the perception that local input was not valued developed from stakeholder perception that only some of their input was being considered and many of their comments were not represented in the final plan. Perceived WO overreach not only strained external relationships, but also impacted internal, vertical relationships within the BLM.

Internal/External Recommendations:

- Identify the sideboards for input and stick to them. External stakeholders will not have patience for any misinterpretations of decision space moving forward.
- Clearly define decision space and process in all future communication.

External Recommendations:

- Highlight the BLM Plan alongside each state plan and show, in easily-understood terms, the similarities and differences.
- Acknowledge state-level working group and LWG success stories, and how those efforts have and will continue to influence future implementation efforts.
- Clearly explain the regulatory authority and effectiveness of state-level and LWG plans.

Messaging and Communication

For future engagement efforts to be successful, messaging needs to be timely, constant, and consistent among the states, as well as among the field and district offices. Organizational interests that cross state lines noted past messages were inconsistent from state to state. Examples were also provided of inconsistent messages from different field and district offices within a single state. Generally, it is important in all communication that the BLM acknowledges the role of industry on BLM land. In rural communities, public land is the economic engine that fuels the tax base, funds schools, and supports local businesses. Restrictions create the potential for a significant impact on communities and it is critical that the BLM publically recognizes the necessity to partner with local stakeholders for mutual success.

DRAFT

Additionally, all agencies (state and federal) involved would be better served by coordinating their communication because the public does not always separate the interests of the different agencies. Rather, they are all perceived as "The Government." Confusion develops when information is inconsistent.

Internal/External Recommendation:

- Avoid gaps. Gaps in communication foster rumors and speculation. If a decision is not yet known, explain the current plan and the factors that may impact it.
- Deliver timely, updated information on GRSG implementation online and through social media.

External Recommendations:

- Provide a clear schedule of milestones and deadlines.
- Share the FWS metric for the 2020 listing decision in easily-understood terms.
- Clearly identify goals and highlight success stories, and demonstrate that measurable progress is occurring.
- Celebrate the positives of preserving the GRSG and its habitat and how, by working together – the GRSG can coexist with the land's multiple uses.

Customized Local Engagement

On-the-ground engagement and planning must be customized to meet the needs and interests of the community and led by local BLM staff. Whereas there was widespread interest in consistent, transparent communication across the GRSG landscape, internal and external stakeholders agreed that the actual engagement from the BLM should be led by field office staff where there is trust and existing relationships. BLM field staff are members of the community and know the stakeholders. Mistrust is fostered from the perception that decisions and communication are being led from the WO.

The individual state and internal summaries include examples of successful engagement processes and specific recommendations. The most effective methods will be the product of local stakeholders and BLM field offices working together to design their unique community processes.

Internal/External Recommendations:

- Facilitate field trips with open dialogue and opportunities for understanding of the various viewpoints. Field-based discussions help encourage stakeholders and the BLM to see the landscape through their neighbors' lenses.
- Work with LWG's where they still exist, reestablish LWG's where they do not, and coordinate with existing RAC's and other established committees/groups.
- Establish the framework for locally-driven engagement efforts in concert with LWG's or established related local committees/groups.
- Use public open houses where they have been successful in the past. Some stakeholders felt open meetings with facilitated information stations on specific topics were good forums for engagement; while others felt they were ineffective and created more confusion.

DRAFT

Local Decision-making Authority

For BLM field staff to be successful, they must be given a greater degree of decision-making power and flexibility within the organization and that impact external interests. BLM field staff can genuinely engage with local stakeholder groups to help guide them to decisions that will be supported. Concern exists that field office staff are apprehensive to make decisions for fear that they will not be supported vertically at the state and WO levels. Frequent staff turnover in the field offices also negatively impacts these local working relationships.

Internal/External Recommendations:

- Identify a BLM field- and/or state-level point person to engage with stakeholders on GRSG issues. If this person exists, he/she may not be known by external stakeholders and additional outreach is needed.
- Field staff should work closely with LWG's to write plans or plan amendments that will be supported. Unsupported plans or plan amendments risk damaging local relationships beyond repair.

External Recommendations:

- Rebuild trust with state government, lost through perceived WO overreach, by focusing on the areas where a state plan and the plan amendments are in agreement and by capitalizing on ancillary or corollary processes with opportunity for agreement amongst the same participants.
- There is a significantly higher perception of success where the BLM actively participated in the development of the state plans, as it allowed the BLM to share information and feedback on how state plans either dovetail with or deviate from federal plans.

Additional Insights

The following comments were provided with less frequency (one – three external subjects) as considerations for future engagement:

- Consider GRSG as part of the larger mixed-use ecosystem and include it in a range of BLM conversations.
- The BLM's institutional memory and knowledge are important factors and must be preserved.
- Restricting the participation of Non-Government Organizations (NGO) in mitigation conversations damages the collaborative process. NGO's have expertise in quantifying and valuing habitat that government agencies can benefit from.
- Fire management decisions impact GRSG policy. Close internal coordination needs to occur with those interests.
- For some states, wild horse management is a dominant issue. Wild horse decisions have significant impacts to GRSG habitat and the two need to be addressed in close coordination.
- Candidate Conservation Agreements (CCA) and Candidate Conservation Agreement with Assurances (CCAA) are models for creating landscapes compatible for GRSG and grazing cohesion. Leverage the success of these private efforts.
- Foster a strong partnership with state government and leverage its stakeholder relationships.
- Utilize the governor-appointed councils to disseminate critical and timely information to stakeholder groups.

DRAFT

- Draw on field office staff expertise where discipline integration is fostered as a model for resource management and effective interdisciplinary teams.
- Maintain consistent coordination/communication with all federal partners.
- In regions where there is checkerboard property ownership, the BLM should ensure neighbors work together in planning what is best on a landscape scale rather than inadvertently pushing impacts onto others.
- Be as inclusive as possible when working with stakeholders in rural communities to improve the perception of transparency and fairness.

DRAFT

INTERNAL SUMMARY (4)

Introduction

The following is a summary of comments received from group conversations with each of the eight state offices and a group conversation with key WO and regional BLM staff. In total, 47 BLM employees participated in the assessment.

Comments and concerns of BLM representatives consistently fell in line with input received from external stakeholders. Rather than duplicate content from the Comprehensive Summary chapter of this document, the following provides supplemental high-level findings and specific recommendations.

Findings and Recommendations

Consistent with comments from external stakeholders, BLM staff routinely emphasized that the push for uniformity among state plans, coupled with short comment periods during development, eliminated the BLM's ability to incorporate local input. This sent the message that public input is not valued. A lack of trust with local stakeholders developed, ultimately resulting in litigation. State and field offices are now in the process of repairing these damaged relationships. Frustration also exists at the field office level and with state/federal partners that guidance on implementation is not being provided quickly enough. States expressed differing opinions whether they have the tools and resources to implement management and monitoring.

Again consistent with comments from external stakeholders, there is a perceived disconnect between field, district, state, and the WO as to the interpretation of terminology and standards. Some BLM staff said they received different directions depending on which office was providing guidance. Staff understand that the public also experiences this disconnect, and that this contributes to the lack of trust and frustration.

Some BLM staff stated that the state/governor-appointed working group structure provided an opportunity to share information and address questions and concerns, but was not conducive to detailed decision making. At the local level, most LWG's are inactive or functioning at a minimum as an opportunity for information sharing. Active LWG's often have private funding. Participation declined when decision-making processes concluded.

Each state began their GRSG management plans at different times and through different processes. Those processes that began early and collaboratively were easier for the BLM to engage with; thus, these state offices have improved coordination and channels of communication with their state and local stakeholders. Those states that started the planning process later felt the pressure of the accelerated timeline to meet the listing date and this resulted in strained relationships between the BLM, state and local stakeholders.

Recommendations:

- Create internal interdisciplinary teams where different resource specialists come together and share impacts/opportunities on the landscape. Use those teams to reach out to other jurisdictions and other agencies at multiple scales.
- Maintain consistent messaging with federal partners, specifically, USFS, FWS, US Geological Survey (USGS) and Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS).

DRAFT

- Assess staff resources at the state and field office level before creating new positions and implementing organization structural changes.
- Recognize and reference the participation of partner agencies throughout communication and maintain regular contact through monthly meetings with partners; specifically, RAC's, tribes, county and state government agencies.
- Salmon, wild horses, wildfire, and drought are among the other issues being addressed at all levels of the BLM. GRSG impacts all of these; therefore, it is critical that communication and coordination occurs across disciplines.
- Some BLM state offices have had success using state government as the facilitator for developing agreements with counties.
- Seek to eliminate inconsistencies in science and management practices across the landscape and use the best research available, including data generated outside of the BLM.
- Identify where field offices are effectively using RAC's and share recommendations to maximize leveraging this resource in other regions.
- RAC's have an active social media and online presence that can be useful in disseminating and maintaining regular community communication.

Specific Examples of Successful Processes:

- Denver Monitoring Summit internal and external work flow diagrams provide a model for interdisciplinary team management.
- The Eagle Lake California field office stakeholder involvement process uses internal and external relationships and resources to maximize the best available tools and information. Staff developed a planning document that clearly describes the amended and non-amended components.
- Utah state office staff trainings (Aug/Sept 2015) and staff-led public meetings (Nov/Dec 2015) effectively put staff in a position to perform meaningful public engagement. State meetings dovetailed into field office-led local meetings.
- USFS Travel Management Planning is complex and controversial with similar challenges. Public engagement meetings, field trips, and usage of local media has proven successful and demonstrates a model for consideration.
- Monitor and learn from ongoing Nevada engagement meetings, hosted by local Cattlemen's Association, geared at addressing misunderstandings and rhetoric.
- CCA's and CCAA's in Oregon are supported by the BLM and federal partners and are a source of pride among local stakeholders. Stakeholders see these as a way of demonstrating how grazing is compatible with GRSG. They have provided the opportunity to leverage what is happening on private lands for a positive message on federal land.
- Powder River EIS (Montana and Wyoming, 2008) was a successful interdisciplinary project that created strong stakeholder relationships through open and honest communication that persevered through litigation.
- Pacific Northwest Forest Plan and Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan have success stories and lessons learned that can be applied to GRSG management.
- BLM Colorado office navigation through mapping challenges with Garfield County demonstrated how strong pre-existing relationships with state and county government proves valuable for unforeseen complications.

DRAFT

- Idaho Soda Fire has examples of well-run, engaging public meetings that produced useful input and fostered collaboration.

DRAFT

IDAHO COMPREHENSIVE REPORT (5)

Introduction

In coordination with the BLM Idaho Office, ten external stakeholders representing different interests and perspectives were identified for participation in the Idaho assessment. While several of these stakeholders participated on LWG's, most were primarily involved with the state-appointed councils charged with developing the state-level GRSG conservation plans. Because each stakeholder had a different level of participation in both the local and state efforts, as well as formal coordination with the BLM, discussion topics varied.

The following is a comprehensive summary of comments received from the seven external stakeholders that agreed to participate and three internal BLM Idaho staff members, grouped by reoccurring themes that emerged through open-ended, participant-led discussion.

Background

The Idaho GRSG Management Plan was developed by the Idaho GRSG Task Force in 1997 and administered by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) and Idaho State Board of Land Commissioners (Land Board). The GRSG Conservation Plan identifies threats at the broad-scale and state-owned lands, while also providing a toolbox of mid- and fine-scale conservation measures for use and/or adaptation by LWG's (as appropriate to local population and habitat conditions), and for use in cases where a LWG plan has not been completed, where no LWG currently exists, or where a LWG plan is silent on a particular issue. Idaho's three-tiered strategy played a role in building the foundation for the BLM-USFS plan. The GRSG Advisory Committee (SAC), formed in 2003, is a state-level group tasked with helping LWG's put meaningful conservation on the ground. In 2006, the SAC published the Conservation Plan for the GRSG in Idaho to replace the 1997 plan, with new information and the completed LWG plans.

Local Working Groups (LWG's)

Of the 12 LWG's in Idaho, ten have completed and published conservation plans. The remaining two LWG's recognized by the USGS GRSG LWG Locator (Mountain Home, South Magic Valley) appeared to never get off the ground.

Most LWG's in Idaho are inactive or meet infrequently. Most private citizens have left LWG's due to lack of regulatory authority, leaving one community member representing private interest as a whole. Some BLM district offices have adopted plans into a local planning effort (Challis), but most LWG plans have no regulatory authority, contributing to low morale, loss of momentum and disbandment.

The Owyhee LWG is active with a local facilitator. Owyhee County has incorporated the LWG implementation plan into the natural resource committee planning process and the LWG is endorsed by the county commission. This group is perceived as a successful model by most stakeholders.

Stakeholders recommended to keep LWG's involved and informed of larger context conversations, but it is unclear what role the BLM sees them playing. LWG's are considered an underutilized resource.

Findings and Recommendations

Input received both internally and externally consistently aligned around common themes. Corresponding recommendations represent specific comments, primarily by single parties. With a

DRAFT

limited set of participants at the state level, internal and external recommendations are combined to protect anonymity.

Decision Space and Process

Consistent with comments throughout the GRSG landscape, in Idaho a clearly defined decision space for stakeholder input is critical for successful engagement efforts moving forward. Consistent with the rest of the GRSG landscape, Idaho internal and external subjects commented that the plan amendments came too late in the process to integrate into the state plan, and without enough review time for comments and changes. Stakeholders feel the BLM WO did not respect the work that occurred on the state and local levels and the state could have supported the plan if the plan revisions process was more transparent and inclusive.

This poses the challenge of overcoming widespread opinion of WO overreach and rebuilding public trust that future engagement will produce collaborative results and decisions. There is the perception that the current bureaucratic process is set up to continue adding hurdles until stakeholders give up. Stakeholders have a desire for open communication, as well as a clear understanding of the finish line and definition of the decision space.

Local Decision-making Authority

Consistent with comments throughout the GRSG landscape, for BLM Idaho field staff to be successful they must be given a greater degree of decision-making power and flexibility within the organization and that impact external interests. It was widely heard that despite strained relationships due to WO overreach, field office staff maintain strong relationships with local stakeholders and a deeper understanding of the land. Grazing on public lands is the economic engine that supports local businesses and the tax base in rural Idaho communities. Stakeholders seek mutual understanding that grazing restrictions have the potential for a ripple-down impact to rural communities, and an opportunity to work with BLM field office staff within their impacted community to identify local solutions.

However, field staff are often apprehensive to make decisions for fear that they will be punished or their decisions overturned at the state office and/or WO. There is interest in allowing a greater degree of flexibility within a larger decision space for field offices to make decisions and feel confident that they will be supported. Additionally, GRSG on top of day-to-day work has overwhelmed the field office staff's workload and there are concerns about how GRSG will change their current job.

Communication and Engagement

On-the-ground engagement and planning must be customized to meet the needs and interests of the community and led by Idaho BLM staff. Stakeholders consistently recommended employing a range of face-to-face and online techniques to reach a wide audience of interests, with field tours as the preferred process to help stakeholders visually understand the issues.

It was consistently recommended that engagement occur locally in the impacted communities, led by BLM field office staff that know the landscape and the stakeholders.

DRAFT

Recommendations:

- Review the BLM Plan side-by-side with the Idaho Plan and create mutual understanding of the differences, and explain where the BLM had to fill in gaps. Acknowledge what the Idaho Plan got right and how it is being carried forward.
- Identify and coordinate with the existing stakeholder groups in each region (Idaho Cattle Association, County Commissioners, and LWG's, if active).
- The BLM has suffered from a high staff turnover rate and lack of continuity. Identify and promote a single GRSG contact.
- Describe the flexibility imbedded in the implementation plan compared to the rigidity of a listing. Differentiate between annual assessment standards and long-term objectives.
- On field tours, invite congressional staff and county commissioners and show what healthy GRSG habitat looks like and how an effective firebreak can help preserve it.
- Consider open houses with maps on the wall and an abundance of staff to promote one-on-one interactions.
- Host local meetings, not "mega meetings." In the Treasure Valley, host meetings in Marsing, Nampa, and Mountain Home, not Boise.
- If interested in gathering statistically significant data, use a telephone survey to targeted user-group databases.
- The BLM needs to educate and celebrate the positive aspects of preserving the GRSG.
- Promote community discussions about how recreation activities (hiking, biking, ATVs, and hunting) can still occur while simultaneously preserving GRSG habitat.
- Must find avenues beyond public forums; examples include social media and brief videos.
- Develop targeted BLM outreach to Idaho delegation to share the good work the BLM is conducting on the ground.
- Share success stories where the BLM is working with ranchers and where ranchers are going above-and-beyond requirements and receiving incentives for their good work.
- Develop a small set of key goals that stakeholders can agree on, then reach them.
- Site specific processes allow stakeholders to deal with issues better than one-size-fits-all.
- Implement greater recognition that positive practices are taking place locally, but communication needs to occur to identify flexibility on the site. Questions exist about the degree the implementation plan will support projects already in place.
- Some ranchers feel strongly that grazing is the answer to fire suppression. Discussion needs to occur about when and where the practice is appropriate.
- Do not get involved in direct raven control, instead address contributing factors that promote raven expansion into GRSG habitat (road kill, unused water basins, dead livestock).

Examples from the Field

Idaho has a history of positive, well-received stakeholder engagement efforts and a productive working relationship between BLM state/field staff and stakeholders. The strong majority of examples feature on-the-ground, frank conversations, in terms any member of the public can understand. In one of these efforts, the comment was made that, "if I throw a football in the sage brush and you cannot see it, then that is good GRSG habitat."

Following are specific processes that were considered successful examples of multiple agencies and interests working together:

DRAFT

- An example of an easily understood discussion that fosters open, comfortable dialogue is DuBois Grouse Days (Upper Snake LWG). This initiative was cited multiple times as a successful, community-led effort that helps the public understand and celebrate the GRSG. The festival features spring bus tours to see GRSG leks in the morning, followed by activities including a raffle/fundraiser, pancake feed and presentations in the afternoon.
- The Idaho BLM office identified roads in the Owyhee Mountains to be upgraded for faster fire response. The office took stakeholders out to show planned improvements. Generally, participants felt they had the ability to provide input all day. After work was completed, the Idaho BLM shared the results, demonstrated what they did, and how response time improved.
- Gateway West Transmission Line engagement is an example of on-the-ground ownership, preferred over on-the-ground buy-in with top-down ownership.
- BLM/IDFG/Idaho Department of Lands (IDL) Land Exchange Team/State Mitigation Plan Team (led by state with BLM involvement).
- Rangeland fire protection state meetings.
- For the Soda Fire restoration, the state had a resource advisor on the ground and completed their own assessment, but worked closely with the BLM. Everyone understood the issues upfront regarding public safety. Weekly meetings at the local level (BLM/IDL/IDFG-coordinated), collaborated and shared resources. Rangeland Fire Protection Association (local ranchers) came forward with projects and cost share.
- BLM/State Drought Task Force featured a pasture exchange web portal. This provided opportunity for farmers with coverage foliage to exchange with farmers in drought conditions.
- GRSG Action Team coordinates how state and federal agency money is used to maximize output and resources.

The following examples also emerged where communication and engagement were considered inadequate or confusing:

- The Owyhee Initiative Wilderness Plan did not consider nine years of work by a diverse stakeholder group due to concern over setting a precedent that could impact other plans.
- BLM/USFS GRSG EIS scoping open houses hosted throughout the state provided little opportunity for participants to understand the science and provide meaningful input.
- BLM grazing plan implementation coordination with lessees of both state and federal land did not include the state upfront. There is a need for BLM transparency when reaching out to lessees on grazing plans and permits. The state should not find out from the lessee.
- The BLM communicated via letters from field offices to permittees regarding potential drought condition impacts. Each region of the state sent letters with different commitments and tones. No letters/communication occurred at the state level.

Ancillary Efforts

Stakeholders provided examples of where conversations are occurring between the BLM and the state and/or stakeholders, where if successful, it could help rebuild trust in the GRSG conversation. Using these ancillary efforts as a means to reengage the appropriate players was widely recommended.

DRAFT

Recommendations:

- Use the Murphy Fire as an opportunity to test grazing practices for fire suppression. There is concern that the practice trades fuel reduction for trampling and riparian impacts. The Murphy Fire provides a preferred test area, over higher-quality GRSG habitat that was not burned.
- The successful and inclusive land exchange process between state and federal agencies that promotes GRSG habitat areas and maximizes state revenue will help rebuild trust and re-open productive communication.
- The Gateway West project could be an opportunity to apply agreed upon mitigation measures developed and adopted by the Governor's Task Force.
- When permit renewals occur, the BLM can apply value and credit (not always monitory, but acknowledgment, support, and providing resources) to ranchers that are using Best Management Practices (BMP) and maintaining the land to preserve GRSG habitat.
- Focus on commonalities between state and BLM plans by identifying consistent threads that are not called out in litigation and move forward. Create a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) on where there is agreement while courts work out where there is not, then reconvene the Governor's Task Force and solicit their feedback on the SDEIS.

DRAFT

MONTANA COMPREHENSIVE REPORT (6)

Introduction

In coordination with the BLM Montana Office, five external stakeholders representing distinct interests and perspectives were identified for participation in the Montana assessment. Most of these stakeholders were primarily involved with the state-appointed councils charged with developing the state-level GRSG conservation plans, though others were involved only tangentially. Because each stakeholder had a different level of participation in both the local and state efforts, as well as formal coordination with the BLM, discussion topics varied.

The following is a comprehensive summary of comments received from the five external stakeholders that agreed to participate and six internal BLM Montana staff members, grouped by reoccurring themes that emerged through open-ended, participant-led discussion.

Background

Montana's Management Plan and Conservation Strategies for GRSG was developed by the Montana GRSG Work Group (SGWG) and finalized in 2005. Participants in the SGWG included representatives of federal and state agencies, tribal representatives, private organizations, and several individuals from the general public, all of whom have a stake in the issue. The plan established a process to achieve GRSG management objectives and provided a framework to guide local management efforts. Regional or local groups were asked to adapt the statewide plan to develop and implement strategies in their respective geographic areas. In 2013, the GRSG Habitat Advisory Council was convened by Governor Bullock and in 2014, the Montana GRSG Habitat Conservation Program was established to provide regulatory protections and establish a mechanism for voluntary habitat conservation actions. A second executive order was issued in 2015 that clarifies aspects of the program.

Local Working Groups (LWG's)

Of the four LWG's in Montana, two have completed and published action plans (Dillon; Miles City/Forsyth), and one LWG has a draft plan that has not been finalized (Glasgow). The Central MT Organized Conservation District LWG is a group of soil conservation districts led by the NRCS. This group does not appear to have a local conservation plan. Each GRSG local work group is co-chaired, typically with one agency person and a private landowner.

Findings and Recommendations

Input received both internally and externally consistently aligned around common themes. Corresponding recommendations represent specific comments, primarily by single parties. With a limited set of participants at the state level, internal and external recommendations are combined to protect anonymity.

Unique Characteristics

The checkerboard land ownership in Montana creates a unique set of challenges for GRSG management, as well as working with private land owners and other stakeholders. Because management actions taken by the BLM can directly impact adjacent property, coordination and collaboration is critical.

This need has resulted in strong local relationships between stakeholders and BLM field and district offices. All interviewed stakeholders expressed a comfort level in calling the BLM with any questions or concerns they had (though they did recognize that this was not true for everyone). BLM staff who have

participated with the local and state working groups have been well received and appreciated. However, there is still a perceived breakdown in communication, information sharing, and decision-making between the field and state office, as well as between the state and the WO.

Some stakeholders also acknowledged that Montana is fairly behind in their planning efforts compared to surrounding states. Because of this, there has not yet been the level of conflict seen in other states. While most stakeholders expressed optimism that the development and implementation of the plans can be done well, there is still a level of concern regarding what the future holds for the state.

Decision Space and Process /Local Decision-making Authority

For Montana BLM field staff to be successful they must be given a greater degree of decision-making power and flexibility within the organization and that impact external interests. Montana stakeholders believe that important decisions regarding GRSG conservation measures were made at the WO level, rather than at the state level, with little regard to local conditions and needs. They believe the Resource Management Plans (RMP) include a number of measures and objectives that do not address conditions occurring on the ground in Montana. There is also the perception that field office staff do not have sufficient information necessary to answer questions and respond to concerns and ideas. Because most stakeholders primarily interact with the BLM at a field office level, this has resulted in a general lack of trust and confidence.

Recommendations:

- Ensure the field staff have all necessary information and empower them to work with the permittees at a local level.
- Simplify the process for public review of the RMP.
- Continue sending BLM staff to participate at both the state and local working group meetings.

Communication and Engagement

On-the-ground engagement and planning needs to be customized for accessibility to the community using easily-understood language and led by Montana BLM staff. While most stakeholders described BLM staff's participation in local and state planning efforts as very helpful and informative, there was still a significant lack of information sharing identified. Some stakeholders stated they did not understand timelines and decision-making processes associated with the RMP's and that if they needed information, they had to specifically request it from the BLM. These same stakeholders stated that they believe the constituencies they represent would greatly appreciate and benefit from more easily accessible information.

Recommendations:

- Engage each of the major stakeholder groups individually. For example, reach out directly to the Montana Petroleum Association and the Montana Cattlemen's Association for specific feedback.
- Host meetings around the state (not just in Billings) to increase the opportunity for a larger number of stakeholders to learn about the GRSG conservation plans and provide input.
- Collaborate with partner agencies and organizations that already have strong outreach and engagement processes, such as the Montana State University Extension, to share information.
- Creativity in outreach will help. One stakeholder suggested participating in the Adopt-a-Lek program.

DRAFT

- Use the NRCS model of promoting successes through periodic email blasts that have links to specific topics. This model allows members of the public to access information that is relevant to them without being inundated.
- Work with partnering agencies to develop consistent terminology.

Examples from the Field

The BLM's participation on the Governor's GRSG Team was widely perceived as a very positive interaction. Participating BLM staff provided regular updates on the RMPs, answered questions to the best of their abilities, and gave feedback on ideas being considered at the state level.

The following examples also emerged where communication and engagement were considered inadequate or confusing:

- The process for public review of the RMP created a significant amount of frustration for those who were specifically asked to provide feedback. There was not sufficient time provided to review such a large document. While much of the feedback provided was not incorporated into the final document, reviewers still had their names listed on the document. Some felt this created the perception that they endorsed or supported what was in the RMP when they really did not.
- The mineral withdrawals created significant frustration, as it is counter to what is in the RMP that stakeholders provided comments on.

DRAFT

NEVADA COMPREHENSIVE REPORT (7)

Introduction

In coordination with the BLM Nevada Office, nine external stakeholders representing distinct interests and perspectives were identified for participation in the Nevada assessment. While several of these stakeholders participated on LWG's, most were primarily involved with the state-level working group charged with developing the state-level GRSG conservation plan. Because each stakeholder had a different level of participation in both the local and state efforts, as well as formal coordination with the BLM, discussion topics varied.

The following is a comprehensive summary of comments received from the nine external stakeholders and seven internal BLM Nevada staff members, grouped by reoccurring themes that emerged through open-ended, participant-led discussion.

Background

In 2012, Governor Brian Sandoval issued an executive order to create the GRSG Advisory Committee. The committee was created to guide Governor Sandoval's course of action on conservation measures to eliminate the need for an ESA listing of the GRSG. The group provided an updated strategy, the Strategic Plan for Conservation of GRSG in Nevada in July of 2012.

The creation of the Sagebrush Ecosystem Program (SEP) was one of the primary recommendations of the 2012 Governor's GRSG Advisory Committee, and in 2014 it released an updated 2014 Nevada GRSG Conservation Plan. The SEP consists of the Sagebrush Ecosystem Council (SEC) and the Sagebrush Ecosystem Technical Team (SETT). The SEP is established under the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources – Division of State Lands. The SEP s a collaborative, multi-stakeholder approach, charged to carry out programs to preserve, restore, and enhance sagebrush ecosystems in the State of Nevada in hopes to improve GRSG populations.

In addition, the SEP has been working with the LWG and Conservation Districts to help identify and implement on-the-ground, site-specific plans to accomplish enhancement and restoration projects in areas that have been identified as important for GRSG conservation, including: 1) monitoring and adaptively managing conservation actions; 2) identifying potential habitat enhancement and restoration projects; and 3) providing local, site-specific expertise on a variety of issues.

Local Working Groups (LWG's)

Of the eight original LWG's in Nevada, all have completed and published conservation plans, five are active, and two cross state lines with California (Bi-State and Washoe/Madoc). The SEC and LWG's coordinated on the mapping of GRSG habitat to varying degrees of success. Most of the LWG's also work on issues outside of GRSG.

Findings and Recommendations

Input received both internally and externally consistently aligned around common themes. Corresponding recommendations represent specific comments, primarily by single parties. With a limited set of participants at the state level, internal and external recommendations are combined to protect anonymity.

DRAFT

The Role of BLM

The BLM plays an important role in GRSG planning, therefore field staff needs to be provided the opportunity to adequately participate. The design of the SEC was greatly driven by the success of Wyoming's GRSG Implementation Team, and includes a broad representation from the relevant stakeholder groups who have a vested interest in the conservation of the GRSG. The BLM participates as an ex-officio to the SEC, providing input and guidance on the development of the state conservation plans. Some stakeholders have stated that the BLM has taken this role seriously, rarely missing meetings, and ensuring that they sent knowledgeable staff with decision-making authority. This high level of participation was viewed very positively by those interviewed, who believe that BLM participation at state and local-level working groups is imperative to good planning.

However, a significant lack of organizational capacity to participate in these meetings, as well as work with permittees, is a challenge that was acknowledge by a strong majority of external stakeholders. For instance, one stakeholder stated that the decrease in range technicians in the field prevented the BLM from doing their job of assessing rangeland health and working with permittees to sufficiently address problems. The existing field staff are perceived as "trapped behind desks writing NEPA documents" rather than engaging with the public and "doing good science."

Local Decision-making Authority

Consistent with comments throughout the GRSG landscape, in Nevada, the general perception externally is that decisions are being made at the WO level, and that the state and district offices have been left out of the loop. While the BLM did participate in the SEC, there is still significant distrust regarding the BLM's capacity and interest to support the state-developed conservation plan. For example, at the time of the interviews, some stakeholders expressed a concern that the BLM did not seem prepared to support the Conservation Credit System (CCS) that was developed by the SEC, a complex banking system for habitat improvements similar to carbon credit trading under the Clean Air Act (By the time this assessment was completed, the BLM had signed a Memorandum of Agreement supporting the state CCS). Thus, all the local knowledge and understanding that is the foundation of the state plan is missing from the BLM plans. Several stakeholders expressed that they felt the WO was disrespectful to the SEC and Governor Sandoval, dismissing stakeholders concerns, and providing form-letter responses to comments rather than actually addressing the questions and concerns.

Nevada State Director John Ruhs is well-received by the strong majority of the stakeholders. His ability to communicate to stakeholders around difficult and controversial issues is seen as a positive change in state leadership and some are hopeful that this ability to communicate and work with permittees will trickle down to the district and field offices.

DRAFT

Communication and Engagement

Consistent with comments throughout the GRSG landscape, in Nevada, for future engagement efforts to be successful, messaging needs to be timely, constant, and consistent. One of the greatest challenges identified by stakeholders when asked about the quality of communication from the BLM is the inconsistent messaging and information sharing occurring within the organization, both vertically and horizontally. Some stakeholders stated that they have received contradicting information from varying field offices, and that often both the WO and the state office have developed mandates and rules that are not in line with previous discussions and commitments.

There is also a perception of secrecy from the BLM described by several stakeholders. An example of this was the meetings that the BLM was hosting for select ranchers. Several stakeholders stated that they were not too concerned about what was being discussed in these meetings because they knew individuals who were in attendance who would share the information, but that the "invite only" approach to these meetings created resentment among members of the public. One stakeholder even cautioned the BLM, stating that Nevada was a very small community, and that eventually everything was heard through the grapevine. Thus, the BLM needs to be proactive and inclusive in their information sharing and outreach.

One stakeholder stated that because the BLM consulted with environmental conservation non-government organizations after the Record of Decision was released, there is now a widespread perception that there are backroom deals occurring. This is further proof that there needs to be an increased emphasis on clear communication and transparency to rebuild public trust.

With regard to interagency partnerships, there was a general sentiment that the federal agencies coordinated with one another well at the local level, but that when agreements and plans were submitted to the WO, consistency disappeared. There was also a strong desire expressed to build upon previous successes to improve coordination and implementation of conservation plans. Utilizing a consultant to facilitate and expedite coordination on the RMP was seen as highly effective, and suggested as something to try again. Because the public often perceives federal agencies as one large governmental entity, it was repeatedly suggested that the BLM should better coordinate communication and planning with the FWS and the USFS, so that there is a more cohesive message with regard to GRSG management.

Recommendations:

- Develop and use consistent terminology, both internally and with other federal and state agencies.
- Do not lump "communication" and "engagement" into the same category. They are very different, and it is the actual engagement that will make the most difference moving forward.
- Engage early and often; while most stakeholders were appreciative that the assessment was being done, they wished it had happened much earlier.
- BLM should better engage at the LWG level by attending meetings and sharing information.
- Improve communication on the time, place, location, and purpose of the planning meetings so they are perceived as transparent and inclusive.
- Learn from the successes of others. It was expressed that how the BLM engages is dependent on the characteristics of the local community.

DRAFT

- Build relationships with local leaders and community members by showing respect, going to lunch, engaging in local community events, etc. This will buy the BLM significant creditability and repair some of the harm caused by frequent staff turnover.
- Hold more frequent, less formal meetings where real issues and solutions can be discussed.
- Do not forget to engage your local conservation districts and state agencies that have responsibility for land management.
- It was often recognized that the BLM is an easy target for stakeholder groups who are more generally dissatisfied with government and public lands. This reality makes it even more critical to develop local, interpersonal relationships with the stakeholders, so the BLM has both formal and informal partners who can provide support throughout implementation and future litigation.
- Engage a consultant to assist in the development of interagency plans to increase efficiencies and address discrepancies arising from differences in process, mission, and culture.

California

California has two areas within the state that have GRSG populations – Northeast and Bi-state. The process for developing GRSG conservation measures in the Bi-state region has been independent of the Northeast efforts due to the distinct population segment involved. Because the GRSG populations are smaller and span across the Nevada border, California has worked closely with the Nevada BLM staff to develop GRSG conservation strategies. Nevada has taken the lead, and because populations in California are fairly robust, GRSG issues are not a very hot topic in California.

Interagency coordination was generally described as sufficient, though differences were identified depending on which district or field office was involved. As was heard in other states, relationships are typically strong at a local level, but become less so at the state and WO level. There were also differences in processes and standards from the varying field offices identified that have caused frustration in the past.

One stakeholder observed that BLM staff have not been out on the ground very often recently, and as their presence increases again there may be push back. In these instances, it was recommended that the BLM identify the permittees that have been engaged in the LWG's and reach out to them for assistance in working with the local communities and other permittees. Demonstrating previous success will be critical to establishing trust.

Modoc County is the primary county that has a high-level of grazing near GRSG populations. The Modoc County Board of Supervisors was granted coordinating agency status, and participated in the review of the RMP. This process was described as fairly frustrating for the county because of the compressed timelines that prevented them from providing thorough review and comments.

As was heard in other states, fire and wild horse management were identified as the largest threats to the landscape, and would likely have the most impact on GRSG habitat.

Recommendations:

- Utilize the Buffalo-Skedaddle Working Group and other LWG's to engage with agency partners and community groups.
- Conservation Districts are a valuable resource that could support a variety of BLM efforts, such as cooperative weed management and information dissemination.

- Better educate district and state BLM staff on the requirements under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act for coordinating with local governments.

Examples from the Field

The Buffalo-Skedaddle Working Group in Northeastern California is a successful LWG that has collaboratively addressed GRSG conservation. The BLM's participation with this group was regarded as very informative and helpful in the planning efforts and was consistently held up as the example of efforts that are working.

DRAFT

WYOMING COMPREHENSIVE REPORT (8)

Introduction

In coordination with the BLM Wyoming Office, 10 external stakeholders representing distinct interests and perspectives were identified for participation in the Wyoming assessment. While several of these stakeholders participated on LWG's, most were primarily involved with the Wyoming GRSG Implementation Team, charged with developing the state-level GRSG conservation plan. Because each stakeholder had a different level of participation in both the local and state efforts, as well as formal coordination with the BLM, discussion topics varied.

The following is a comprehensive summary of comments received from 10 external stakeholders and four internal BLM Wyoming staff members. Comments are grouped by reoccurring themes that emerged through open-ended, participant-led discussion.

Background

Wyoming proactively created the first ever comprehensive statewide GRSG conservation plan in 2003 known as the Wyoming GRSG Conservation Plan. This strategy was driven by executive order and developed through the work of a GRSG Implementation Team (SGIT) and LWG's that engaged local, state and federal agencies, as well as industry and conservation groups.

Each LWG focuses on and develops a protection strategy tailored to a core management area. Voluntary actions are identified for pre-existing uses within the areas, and new guidelines have been developed to guide how future development must occur to minimize impacts to habitat. Additional products that have been created through the LWG's are vegetation treatment protocols, restoration goals and projects and regular review and monitoring requirements. These efforts have lead Wyoming to be considered a leader in the GRSG conservation movement.

Local Working Groups (LWG's)

There are eight LWG's in Wyoming, all of which are active. Each created a conservation plan pertaining to their core management areas in 2007, with review and amendments submitted in 2014. The work of the LWG's is reviewed and supported by the SGIT, which consists of high-level representatives from varying interests around the state. The SGIT is also a statutory body that provides recommendations to the legislature regarding regulatory actions necessary to maintain and enhance GRSG populations and habitat. This major effort is coordinated through the Wyoming Game & Fish Department (WGF).

Findings and Recommendations

Input received both internally and externally consistently aligned around common themes. Corresponding recommendations represent specific comments, primarily by single parties. With a limited set of participants at the state level, internal and external recommendations are combined to protect anonymity.

Decision Space and Process

Internally and externally stakeholders recognize the success of the SGIT as the foundation for successful relationships and GRSG efforts in Wyoming. According to the strong majority of interviewees, Wyoming's approach to GRSG management has been highly successful due to Governor Dave Freudenthal's foresight to create the SGIT in 2007. Because this decision-making body was formed early,

DRAFT

there was ample time to not only fully develop the core area management strategy, but to also address the interpersonal relationships that this planning effort necessitates. The BLM has been an active partner in the SGIT, as well as the "Big Dogs" meetings, which are comprised of leadership from state and federal agencies within Wyoming. Their participation in these meetings has allowed them to not only provide the state with updates on what the BLM is planning, but also allow participants to provide feedback to the BLM for close consideration.

Members of the SGIT represent the full spectrum of stakeholder groups with a vested interest in GRSG management. While some expressed that it was a bit of a rocky start, trust building was folded into the process, and has promoted honesty and transparency throughout the many years of decision making. Wyoming is a rural state with a very low population density. Because of this, stakeholders stated that being able to talk through difficult issues that greatly impact the state's economy and variety of industries is critical, as it also allows them to be good neighbors and citizens.

The interaction between the SGIT and LWG's is productive. Information is shared between the LWG's and the SGIT. The individuals who participate on the LWG's have "on the ground" understanding that is important for the SGIT to consider and the SGIT sends their ideas out to the LWG's for review and feedback. While not all LWG's have a BLM representative, some stakeholders expressed that this would be highly beneficial for the sake of sharing information and receiving feedback.

The SGIT looks at specific requests and ideas that are associated with land uses, such as wind farms and mines, and works through how to address these requests through the established processes and standards. The BLM is typically a part of this conversation; thus, are able to provide feedback on feasibility early and often, rather than allowing a project to make progress and then stop.

An additional benefit of the SGIT model is the support provided to the BLM if the implementation of the plan is challenged. Because solutions were developed collaboratively, members of the SGIT voiced that they would be willing to provide assistance to the BLM when addressing these challenges.

Local Decision-making Authority

Consistent with comments throughout the GRSG landscape, for Wyoming BLM field staff to be successful they must be given a greater degree of decision-making power and flexibility within the organization and that impact external interests, while maintaining consideration for landscape-level needs. The greatest challenge expressed repeatedly by stakeholders within Wyoming was the changing directives given from the WO to the state offices. Because GRSG management is such a personal and local issue to landowners and permittees living and working in Wyoming, stakeholders have expressed an interest in having the management plans developed around the core management areas so the plan is receptive to local conditions. They feel when a plan is developed collaboratively with the state and BLM, it is challenging to implement because of the restrictions put on the plans by the WO.

There are perceived discrepancies between the core area strategy and the BLM's RMP that concern several stakeholders. It is well-recognized that the BLM is attempting to create consistency in GRSG management across the range, but there have been a number of challenges identified with this approach. The regional differences existing in the west make a uniform system impossible. For instance, one stakeholder identified that a management plan to reduce the impacts of energy development are very different than one working to mitigate impacts from fire and invasive species. The attempt at a uniform approach being driven by the WO is seen as the BLM being out of touch with what is actually occurring on the ground.

DRAFT

While most stakeholders stated that decisions that impact Wyoming should be made by those with local knowledge, there was still a big push for landscape-level analysis and planning. Some stakeholders voiced concerns that the BLM was so focused on GRSG, that they were neglecting the many other threats to the landscape that will also ultimately impact GRSG. Examples provided included cheat grass encroachment, wildfire and activities associated with energy development, such as noise disturbance, development of tall structures and habitat degradation.

Concern about wild horse management as it relates to rangeland health was also consistently mentioned. One stakeholder clearly stated that while the GRSG conservation efforts are important, they do not really matter unless a plan to address wild horses on the landscape can be developed. Wild horses are perceived as not just impacting GRSG habitat, but having a significant effect on the ability of livestock to find sufficient forage on permitted BLM allotments.

Recommendations:

- Generally speaking, stakeholders do understand that the state office has to wait for direction from the WO before they can communicate final decisions and plans. However, answering questions as fully as possible, as well as sharing what is known and still unknown, is important for establishing transparency and trust, and helps dispel unfounded rumors.
- Provide equal opportunities for stakeholder groups to participate in the discussions and planning, not just cooperating agencies and commissioners.

Communication and Engagement

Consistent with comments throughout the GRSG landscape, in Wyoming, for future engagement efforts to be successful, messaging needs to be timely, constant, and consistent. Within Wyoming, most stakeholders believe they have adequate communication with BLM staff from the local field and district offices. Some did identify that the high level of turnover often impacted the BLM's ability to establish and rely on healthy working relationships, critical in states like Wyoming, but that if these relationships did exist then there was a high level of comfort that the BLM would listen to landowner and permittee concerns and work with them to address any issues. Repeatedly, stakeholders expressed a very different opinion with regard to the WO. Many stakeholders expressed that coordination with the WO was very challenging and that it was difficult to make contact with the appropriate person, let alone receive a timely response.

There are varying perceptions on how well Planning 2.O is working. Some individuals believe that the BLM is actively addressing improved community engagement and think this very promising, while others are reserving judgment until they see these efforts actually implemented.

Another challenge that was consistently identified was the occasional disconnect between BLM offices, both vertically and horizontally. Several stakeholders stated that information they have received from BLM staff has differed depending on which field office they were working with, and that often the districts are not up to speed on state office decisions.

This creates frustration for stakeholders who feel they cannot rely on the information to plan their strategies for meeting the conservation plan objectives when the standards change.

Recommendations:

- The current model of developing and implementing GRSG conservation measures at a state level is widely perceived as successful. Continue to have the BLM fully engage at the SGIT and "Big

DRAFT

Dog" meetings. Send BLM field staff to the LWG meetings as often as possible to share and collect information.

- Given the high number of stakeholders interested in GRSG conservation and the reduced capacity of BLM staff, a number of stakeholders recommended the BLM engage the public through the internet and social media. Updates on planning and opportunities to provide feedback online were among the most suggested ideas for more frequently reaching a broader audience.
- One stakeholder recommended that the BLM rely more heavily on the SGIT to disseminate information to the general public. For instance, there could be an informational update meeting that occurs in conjunction with SGIT meetings. These updates could be open to the public, and SGIT members could carry a higher level of responsibility for going back to their stakeholder group and sharing the information that was provided by the BLM.
- Develop a process for disseminating consistent and timely information across the field and district offices. Consistency is critical to public trust and respect.
- Develop consistent terminology among agencies.
- Send staff out to explain the instructional memorandums to stakeholder groups.

DRAFT

APPENDIX A: INTERNAL MEMO

At the request of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), The Langdon Group (TLG), a subcontractor of Kearns & West through the Department of Interior Office of Collaborative Action and Dispute Resolution (CADR), will conduct a situational assessment of the BLM's Greater Sage Grouse (GRSG) Conservation Management Plan efforts across the eight primary GRSG states (California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah and Wyoming). The findings and recommendations provided by the assessment will help inform development of BLM's stakeholder engagement strategy to support GRSG implementation on-the-ground.

TLG will work as a neutral third-party to conduct up to 100 telephone discussions with BLM state office employees and a diversity of stakeholders to assess the status, accomplishments, questions and concerns of the GRSG local working groups (LWG) and related, locally-based stakeholder efforts. The draft stakeholder discussion guide (**APPENDIX A**) contains information about the proposed discussion structure and process. The assessment will follow a two-stage process.

Stage One discussions will occur internally with State Directors, Public Affairs Officers, CADR Coordinators, GRSG Implementation Lead, and others as appropriate. At the same time calls with also occur with the chairperson of the Governor-appointed, state-level GRSG Implementation Committees (or their representative) and others as appropriate. Additional discussions will occur with national and regional BLM representatives as described in **Appendix B**.

Stage One discussions will seek to establish a big-picture understanding of the current situation. Specifically, the type of communication/engagement that has occurred in the past between the BLM and state/local stakeholders; what worked and did not, and where improvements are needed; expectations/vision for future engagement efforts; and are the key stakeholders for subsequent (Stage Two) discussions.

Stage Two discussions will occur with key stakeholders in each State. TLG identified the proposed Stage Two stakeholders for each state **(APPENDIX B)** through online research of the LWG's, conservation plan reviews, and media coverage research. Efforts were made to include balanced representation from key stakeholder groups (cattleman's associations, industry, conservation interests, farming, etc.), LWG's, and tribal interests. As not every stakeholder involved in GRSG can be spoken with, TLG looked for opportunities where a single representative had involvement on multiple LWG's or with multiple states within the Great Basin or Rocky Mountain region. TLG sought to identify an individual voice for each stakeholder category recognizing that a single representative cannot speak for all the interests in a particular category.

TLG will develop a final draft, state-specific Stage Two stakeholder discussion list in consultation with BLM State Directors (or their appointed representative) and the GRSG engagement team. Input gathered from the Governor appointed Committee Chair also will be used in developing the state-specific lists of Stage Two participants.

An invitation letter (draft, **APPENDIX C**) to participate in the stakeholder discussions will be sent by each state office to the identified stakeholders in advance of their respective stage discussions. TLG will coordinate logistics with each state office's designated staff. State-level, BLM CADR Coordinators may be able to assist with this task if needed.

Upon completion of the assessment, TLG will develop a draft comprehensive report of the findings and resulting proposed recommendations for external stakeholder engagement. Early drafts will be reviewed by State Directors and the GRSG Engagement Lead/Team The final report will be distributed to all participants, posted on the BLM website, and shared via conference presentations. To protect

interests and foster an open discussion, specific comments or findings will not be attributed from anyone by name or position.

Please provide feedback on the draft stakeholder discussion guide (**APPENDIX A**) and draft invitation letter (**APPENDIX C**) on or before Feb. 5, 2016. Insight and input at the state level is critical to the success of this collaborative effort.

DRAFT

APPENDIX B: DISCUSSION GUIDE

The situation assessment is focused at the local level in support of on-the-ground implementation. It is designed to help the BLM understand the various Local efforts by identifying what worked and why, what did not and why, lessons learned, recommendations for future phases, and key stakeholders. Discussions also will identify each working group's current status and level of functionality moving forward. TLG will help to assess how BLM can best connect with, learn from, and support these efforts moving forward. The findings and recommendations provided by this assessment will help inform the development of BLM's stakeholder engagement plan and possible transition to a more collaborative strategy, as appropriate.

The format of key stakeholder discussions is intended to be conversational. The CORE questions will be asked of all participants. Additional questions are intended to help steer the discussion when it needs help and provide the interviewer with a checklist of areas to focus the discussion to ensure TLG gets input that is valuable and constructive.

Discussions will be conducted informally, and this protocol is a guide. TLG may not raise all topics and the order of the topics covered in each discussion may differ depending on comments and the time available. To protect interests and foster an open discussion, specific comments or findings will not be attributed from anyone by name, position or agency.

Questions

CORE (asked of all participants)

- How do you see BLM's past and future role/participation in state and local level groups?
- What is your vision for GRSG implementation, particularly related to external engagement (i.e., what would success look and feel like)?
- How do you want to be engaged moving forward?
- What do you need from BLM to be successful?
- What level of outreach is most needed from BLM, why and what should it look like?
- Who else should we be talking to at the local level? Anyone at the national level?

STATE LEVEL WORKING GROUP *(This may take different forms in every states and some may have multiple advisory, governor's task force and implementation teams; or groups may have evolved and taken on new titles)*

- What is the status of your state group?
- Is the group actively engaged with implementing the GRSG action plan or management plan in your state? Why or why not is this happening?
- Did the state group efforts work cooperatively with the local groups?

Local Working Group (LWG) or other organized local efforts SUBSTANTIVE INTERESTS

- What is the status of your LWG?
- What are the notable outcomes from the LWG?
- If the LWG is inactive, should it be revived? For what purpose? What should be the future mission of the LWG?
- Are there underlying issues/disagreements that were not addressed at any stage? Explain.
- How have new RMP Amendment commitments impacted your ability to implement commitments in your current LWG plans?

DRAFT

LWG or other organized local efforts OUTCOMES AND PROGRESS

- Would you define your efforts as successful? Why? Why not?
- What areas were successful? Do you think these are implementable on a broader scale?
- What areas could have been improved on?
- Are there lessons learned from this experience that you would suggest for future management efforts?
- What do you perceive as the current value of the LWG?
- What challenges does the LWG face moving forward? How can these be overcome to help foster a collaborative environment with purpose moving forward?

LWG or other organized local efforts PROCESS

- Has your LWG used a third-party facilitator in the past? Was that beneficial or would have been beneficial? Why?
- Are there lessons learned from other LWG experiences that would be valuable moving forward?
- Were the appropriate people at the table? Who was missing?
- Did the LWG have balanced representation from all interests? Explain.
- Were all interests provided the opportunity to provide their input/opinion and was it respected and considered? Can you provide an example of this?

DRAFT

APPENDIX C: STAKEHOLDER LETTER

Dear:

As a stakeholder in the greater sage grouse (GRSG) conservation implementation efforts, your involvement and expertise is critical to the effective conservation of the GRSG and its habitat.

As you likely know, on September 22, 2015, the Department of Interior determined not to list the GRSG under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Currently, the BLM and US Forest Service (USFS), in coordination with local agencies and partners, are implementing various Federal, State, and Local GRSG Management Plans.

The BLM recognizes that the hard work is occurring on the ground to implement the plans and conserve the GRSG. To help craft a successful engagement strategy, we want to hear from local stakeholders with a vested interest in its success. The BLM has asked The Langdon Group (TLG), a western-based company that specializes in collaborative processes, to conduct a large-scale assessment across the range of the GRSG landscape.

As a neutral third-party, TLG will conduct confidential telephone discussions with a diversity of stakeholders to clarify the issues, needs and concerns associated with work occurring on the ground, identify successes and shortcomings, and the current status of the various local working group efforts.

In the coming days, you may be contacted by a TLG staff member. We appreciate your candid insight, comments and input. We're especially interested in -- How do you see BLM's past and future role in state and local level efforts? What do you need from BLM to be successful? What is your vision for the GRSG implementation and how can we most effectively involve and engage external interests? To protect your interests and foster an open discussion, specific comments or findings will not be attributed in the resulting report from anyone by name or position.

Your participation is appreciated. Please do not hesitate to contact my office if you have any questions or concerns (STATE OFFICE POINT OF CONTACT AND INFO). If you have any questions for The Langdon Group, they can be reached at 800-252-8929.

DRAFT

APPENDIX D: STATE COMPARISON TABLE

State	Implementation Mechanism	Local State Agency	Oversight Provider	All Lands Approach	Implementation Mechanism	Local Working Groups	Year Formed	Conservation Plan, Implementation Date
Colorado	Governor's Executive Order Colorado Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan 2008 House Bill 1298	Colorado Parks and Wildlife DNR (for 1298)	Colorado Parks and Wildlife	MOU – Coordinate with federal land/mineral owner	For oil and gas wells permitted by COGCC – if they are located within GRSG habitat, consultation with Colorado Parks and Wildlife is required.	Middle Park	1999	Yes, Jan 2001
						North Park	1998	Yes, Dec 2001
						Northern Eagle/Southern Routt	1998	Yes, Sept 2004
						Northwest Colorado	1996/1999	Yes, April 2008
						Piceance/Parachute/Roan	Unknown	Yes, April 2008
Idaho	Governor's Executive Order 2015-04 on May 27, 2015	Office of Species Conservation for Federal Lands Department of Lands (IDL) – State and Private Lands	Implementation Task Force	Yes Three-tiered conservation approach	IDL regulatory and assistance functions that may impact greater sage grouse or their habitat.	Big Desert	2007	Yes, March 2009
						Challis	2002	Yes, Oct 2007
						Curlew	1998	Yes, June 2004
						East Idaho Uplands	2007	Yes, June 2009
						Jarbidge	1999	Yes, Dec 2006
						Mountain Home	Unestablished	No
						North Magic Valley	2007	Yes, Dec 2009
						Owyhee	1998	Yes, June 2000
						Shoshone Basin	1994	Yes, Dec 2006
						South Magic Valley	Unestablished	No
						Upper Snake Idaho	1998	Yes, June 2004
						West Central Idaho	2004	Yes, May 2009
Montana	Governor Executive Order and Montana Senate Bill 0261	Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (i.e. state lands)	Montana Sage-grouse Oversight Committee	Yes	Upon requirement for a permit from the State.	Central Montana Organized Conservation District	Unknown	Yes, Unknown
						Dillon	2003	Yes, Nov 2011
						Glasgow	2004	Yes DRAFT, No FINAL
						Miles City/Forsyth	2004	Yes, March 2011
Nevada (includes California)	Executive Order 2012-09, Executive Order2012-19, NRS Chapter 232.162.	Nevada Departments of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR), Wildlife (NDOW), and Agriculture (NDA)	Sagebrush Ecosystem Council (SEC)	No	Upon review and approval by the Sagebrush Ecosystem Program (SEP)	Bi-State (with CA)	2002	Yes, June 2004
						Lincoln	2002	Yes, May 2004
						North Central Nevada	2002	Yes, May 2004
						Northeastern Nevada Stewardship Program	2002	Yes, March 2004
						South Central Nevada	2002	Yes, May 2004
						Stewardship Alliance of Northeast Elko County		Yes, Dec 2014
						Washoe/Madoc (with CA)	2002	Yes, July 2004
						White Pine	2002	Yes, April 2004
Oregon	Governor's Executive Order 15-18; GRSG Conservation Assessment & Strategy for Oregon (2011); The Oregon Sage-grouse Action Plan (2015); GRSG Conservation Rule OAR 660-023-0115; GRSG Mitigation Rules OAR 635-0140-0000 thru 635-140-0025	Department of Fish and Wildlife, Department of Land Conservation & Development; others with minor roles, State Lands, Agriculture, Forestry, OWEB, ODOT, OSU Extension, Geology and Mining, and many others with specific tasks (see EO 15-18 pages 3-6)	Coordinating Council	Yes "All Lands, All Threats"	Upon review or approval required by State Agency and pursuant to OAR 660-023-0115	Baker	2006	Yes, Aug 2005
						Burns	2006	Yes, Aug 2005
						Lakeview	2006	Yes, Aug 2005
						Prineville	2005	Yes, Aug 2005
						Vale	2006	Yes, Aug 2005
Utah	Governor's Executive Orders	Public Lands Policy Coordinating Office and Division of Wildlife Resources	When management or policy decisions are issued by state agencies	No	When management or policy decisions are issued by state agencies	Cache/East Box Elder	2005	No
						Castle County	2005	Yes, Dec 2006
						Color County	2001	Yes, Feb 2008
						Dove Creek/Monticello	1996	Yes, May 2000
						Morgan/Summit	2005	Yes, Aug 2006
						Parker Mountain	1998	Yes, Oct 2006
						Rich County	2005	Yes, Oct 2006
						Southwest Desert	2003	Yes, Feb 2007
						Strawberry Valley	2003	Yes, Aug 2006
						Uintah Basin	2003	Yes, Jan 2007
						West Box Elder	2003	Yes, July 2006
						West Desert	2003	Yes, July 2007
Wyoming	Governor's Executive Orders	Wyoming Game and Fish	Wyoming Sage Grouse Implementation Team	Yes	Upon review or approval required by State Agency	Bates Hole/Shirley Basin	2004	Yes, Jan 2007
						Big Horn Basin	2004	Yes, Aug 2007
						Northeast Wyoming (Powder River Basin)	2004	Yes, Aug 2006
						Southcentral Wyoming	2004	Yes, March 2007
						Southwest Wyoming	2004	Yes, July 2007
						Upper Green River Basin	2004	Yes, July 2007
						Upper Snake River Basin Wyoming	2004	Yes, Jan 2008
						Wind River/Sweetwater River Basin	2004	Yes, Aug 2007

APPENDIX E: PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS OR REPRESENTING INTEREST

The following external organizations or representing interest participated in the assessment. Some parties wore multiple "hats" and the strong majority chaired or served on a local work group, state-level working group or both.

1. American Colloid Company, Wyoming
2. California Department of Fish and Wildlife
3. Carson City, Nevada
4. Colorado Division of Wildlife
5. Eureka County, Nevada
6. Fremont County, Wyoming
7. Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, US Forest Service
8. Idaho Conservation League
9. Idaho Department of Fish and Game
10. Idaho Department of Lands
11. Idaho rancher
12. Missouri River Conservation Districts Council
13. Modoc County, California
14. Montana Audubon
15. Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks
16. Montana Petroleum Association
17. Nevada Department of Agriculture
18. Nevada Mining Association
19. Nevada rancher x3
20. Oregon State University Institute for Natural Resources
21. Owyhee County, Idaho
22. Sierra Club, Nevada
23. The Nature Conservancy, Idaho
24. The Wilderness Society, Idaho
25. Thunder Basin Grasslands Prairie Ecosystem Association, Wyoming
26. US Fish and Wildlife Service, Nevada x2
27. US Fish and Wildlife Service, Wyoming
28. West Slope Colorado Oil and Gas Association
29. Wood River Land Trust, Idaho
30. Wyoming Audubon
31. Wyoming Game and Fish
32. Wyoming Governor's Office
33. Wyoming Office of State Lands
34. Wyoming Outdoor Council
35. Wyoming Wildlife and Natural Resource Trust
36. Wyoming Wildlife Federation

DRAFT

DRAFT